

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on February 13, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-21 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1-3 and 5; 2) added new claims 22-26; and 3) canceled claims 6-21. As such, claims 1-5 and 22-26 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

Objections

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended several paragraphs to correct some of these informalities.

Claim 6 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 6 has been canceled. Thus, this objection is now moot.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to as not including reference signs. Specifically, that "setup view 708" and "search engine 64 and notification module 66" were not labeled. Applicants have amended a typographical error in paragraph 0052 to label setup view as being 730 and not 708. Applicants have also amended paragraph 0073 to remove the sentence regarding search engine 64 and notification module 66. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these objections are now moot.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled by the specification. While Applicants do not agree with the assertion, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include more limitations and to clarify what Applicants are claiming. Claims 7-20 have been canceled.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections/35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunlavy, U.S. Patent 6,937,257 (hereinafter “Dunlavy”). The Office Action rejected claims 2-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunlavy in view of Henderson, U.S. Publication 2004/0181513; Claims 6, 11, 16 and 21 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunlavy in view of Knight, U.S. Patent 6,515,681 (hereinafter “Knight”). Applicants have amended claim 1 to include limitations from some of the claims that were rejected by the combination of Dunlavy with Knight or Henderson. Accordingly, Applicants will address the rejection of claim 1 with respect to the combination of Dunlavy, Knight, and Henderson.

Dunlavy describes a graphical user interface that allows a user to “place and connect objects representing pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic elements.” (Dunlavy, Abstract.) Dunlavy uses four general types of windows in his GUI: a model construction window, an equations window, a debugging window, and a messages window. (Dunlavy, col.4 ll.36-39.) “The model construction window 104 displays the graphical model under construction. The equations window 108 displays equations derived from the graphical model. The debugging window 112 displays a plot of variables selected from the graphical model, either against time or against each other. Errors and warnings are listed in the messages window 116. Typical error messages include syntax errors, use of undefined variables in user code, misuse of units, divide by zero, etc.” (Dunlavy, col.4 ll.43-51.)

Henderson describes a system and method to acquire information from a database. A user workstation communicates with a system server via a web browser to query a database or databases. (Henderson, Fig.1 and paragraphs 0030-0033.) The system server includes a query application to obtain any sort of information from a relational database. (Henderson, Fig. 1 and paragraph 0030.)

Knight describes a GUI for an online message board. Part of the functionality of the message board is the ability of each previously posted text message to “be broken down, and a record created in a database [] for each keyword, along with a counter that is incremented for each usage of the keyword.” (Knight, col.25 ll.13-26.)

The combination of Dunlavey, Henderson, and Knight does not describe what Applicants' claims require. Specifically, for claim 1, the combination does not describe:

A graphical user interface (GUI) for a capture system, the GUI comprising:

a search editor view to enable parameters of a search of tags of objects captured by the capture system to be defined, the capture system to intercept and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule;

a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.

The combination describes a GUI that allows a user to query a database of broken down posted text messages. The combination does not describe a GUI of a captures system that intercepts and stores network transmitted objects according to a capture rule. Knight simply states that the text of a previously posted text message can be broken down. The cite provided by the Office Action for Knight does not indicate that Knight describes the ability to define how this text is broken down, if it should be broken down, etc. Accordingly, Applicants' claim 1 is not described by the cited prior art. Claims 2-5 are dependent upon claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

In light of the comments above, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of all claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all redetections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

9/13/07



Edwin H. Taylor
Reg. No.: 25,129

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300